

Philip J. Berg, Esquire
Pennsylvania I.D. 9867
LAW OFFICES OF PHILIP J. BERG
555 Andorra Glen Court, Suite 12
Lafayette Hill, PA 19444-2531
Telephone: (610) 825-3134
E-mail: philjberg@gmail.com

Attorney for Plaintiffs

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA,
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

LISA LIBERI, et al,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

ORLY TAITZ, et al,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:

8:11-cv-00485-AG (AJW)

**DECLARATION OF PHILIP J.
BERG, ESQUIRE**

Date of Hearing: June 13, 2011

Time of Hearing: 10:00 a.m.

Location: Courtroom 10D

Declaration of Philip J. Berg, Esquire

I, Philip J. Berg, Esquire, am over the age of eighteen [18] and am a party to the within action. I have personal knowledge of the facts herein, and if called to do, I could and would competently testify. I am making this Declaration under the penalty of perjury of the Laws of the United States pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1746.

1. I am an Attorney in good standing, licensed to practice law in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I am licensed to practice in the U.S.

1 District Courts, Middle and Eastern District of Pennsylvania; the Third
2 Circuit Court of Appeals; the Pennsylvania Supreme Court; and the U.S.
3 Supreme Court.
4

5 2. Plaintiffs were forced to file suit against Defendants, including Orly
6 Taitz and Defend our Freedoms Foundations, Inc. for their illegal
7 background checks, illegal access of Lisa Liberi and Lisa Ostella's credit
8 reports, and the publication of all their confidential primary identification
9 information. The publication of private data included but was **not** limited to
10 their full Social Security numbers; dates of birth; place of birth; mother's
11 maiden name; father's name; credit details; and other private data.
12
13

14 3. Plaintiffs did **not** bring suit as a result of Taitz disclosure of a
15 "supposed" criminal record of Liberi. However, in Plaintiffs Complaint
16 there is a cause of action for Slander, Defamation and Libel as a result of
17 Defendants publication that Liberi had been convicted of crimes that she had
18 **not** been; Defendants false publication that Ostella had a criminal record;
19 that Liberi has a criminal history going back to the 1990's; that Liberi has a
20 pending criminal case against her; that Liberi and Ostella stole monies from
21 Taitz and her Foundation; that Liberi and Ostella "hacked" Taitz PayPal
22 account and website, and many other false accusations.
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 4. Taitz still to this date continues claiming Liberi is a “career forger”
2 and been convicted of forgery of documents and forgery, which is **not** true.
3
4 Liberi has never been convicted of forging documents or forgery of any
5 documents.

6 5. Plaintiffs have filed a Motion Seeking Leave to Amend their
7 Complaint. However, Plaintiffs are also Seeking to Amend their Complaint
8 in their Response in Opposition to Defendants Taitz and Defend our
9 Freedoms Anti-SLAPP Motion and Motion to Dismiss pursuant to Fed. R.
10 Civ. P. 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6).

11 6. Further, Taitz has claimed she never filed a previous Anti-SLAPP
12 Motion and Plaintiffs have committed Fraud upon the Court by claiming she
13 had. The truth of the matter, as demonstrated by the Docket, Taitz filed an
14 Anti-SLAPP Motion almost identical to the one filed April 25, 2011, on
15 June 16, 2009, which appears as Docket Entry No. 61.

16 7. Further, Taitz claims that this Court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction
17 in that Liberi has **not** proven to her or provided her with her (Liberi’s)
18 Driver’s License. Liberi is **not** a citizen of the State of California and Taitz
19 has failed to address why she feels diversity is lacking. Diversity is proven
20 by the fact that none of the Plaintiffs reside in the same state as any of the
21 Defendants. None of the Plaintiffs reside in the State of California. It is **not**

1 a requirement that every party provide their Driver's License in Diversity
2 Cases.

3
4 8. Taitz is well aware of where Liberi resides. Taitz has called for her
5 supporters to commit certain acts where Liberi resides. Taitz has filed false
6 police reports against Liberi where Liberi resides; Taitz has harassed the
7 Probation Department where Liberi resides; Taitz has published repeatedly
8 Liberi's home address and telephone number as well as filed it with this
9 Court.
10

11
12 9. Taitz threatened to take me down and to do so she said she was going
13 to destroy Lisa Liberi, my paralegal, and get rid of her.
14

15 10. Liberi, for security reasons, will **not** provide Taitz her Driver's
16 License. Taitz has given Liberi's home address to a man who was convicted
17 of crimes against Liberi and her son, who a restraining order was pending
18 against and as a fact, Liberi was provided a confidential address for her and
19 her son's protection. Taitz will publish Liberi's Driver's License as she has
20 done with Liberi's Social Security number, date of birth, place of birth,
21 mother's maiden name, father's name, etc.
22

23
24 11. Liberi is a certified Paralegal. Liberi does **not** fundraise for me; she
25 does **not** access any of my financial accounts, does **not** have access to any of
26
27
28

1 my donor's credit card details and Liberi is **not** an Investigator. Liberi
2 researches the laws and drafts briefs accordingly.

3
4 12. Taitz continues claiming that she is a whistleblower and the public
5 had a right to know that Liberi was a career document forger and that Liberi
6 has been convicted of a crime, etc. Again, Liberi has never been convicted
7 of forging documents. Taitz fails to tell this Court she employed
8 approximately five (5) felons, some with convictions of forgery and others
9 with violent convictions. Charles Edward Lincoln, III has a felony
10 conviction(s); Larry Sinclair has felony convictions and served prison time;
11 Lucas Smith has felony convictions of forgery of identification documents
12 and Taitz filed a "forged" Kenyan Birth Certificate in President Obama's
13 name procured by Lucas Smith in Judge Carter's Court; and several other
14 felons; however, Taitz never disclosed any information pertaining to them.

15
16
17
18
19 13. The conduct of the Defendants, as outlined in Plaintiffs Complaint
20 and will be better outlined in Plaintiffs First Amended Complaint constitutes
21 cyber-stalking; cyber-bullying; cyber-harassment; invasion of privacy; and
22 other dangerous conducts. As a result, the Plaintiffs have suffered severe
23 damages.
24

25
26 14. For the reasons outlined herein and in Plaintiffs Response in
27 Opposition, Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support thereof and
28

1 my Declaration, Defendants Motion must be Denied and Plaintiffs should be
2 Granted Leave to Amend their Complaint.
3
4

5 I declare under the penalty of perjury of the Laws of the United States and
6 California that the foregoing is true and correct.
7

8 Executed this 5th day of May, 2011 in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,
9
10 County of Montgomery.

11 /s/ Philip J. Berg
12 Philip J. Berg, Esquire, Declarant
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28